

224



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/758,893 | 01/11/2001 | Jin Li | 2000.047800 | 8422 |

23720 7590 10/15/2004

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER

BRINEY III, WALTER F

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2644

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/758,893

Applicant(s)

LI, JIN

Examiner

Walter F Briney III

Art Unit

2644

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attached.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 3-13, 15-18 and 32-37 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.

The applicant's arguments regarding claims 1 and 19 are not persuasive and do not place this application in condition for allowance, therefore, the proposed amendments to claims 3, 8, 9, 15-18, 32-34, 36, and 37 have not been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 19, filed 06 August 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant alleges that claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Cotreau in view of Misu because the filter of Cotreau does not store a voltage representative of a voltage level between the ring and tip terminal; the examiner respectfully disagrees. See page 13. In particular, the voltage at node V1 (32) is the ringing voltage, say V_{ring} , and a DC offset, say V_{DC} . Analyzing the loop suggests that all current provided by the ringing generator is returned to the ground node through switch (20). In effect, a measured voltage division occurs at V2 (34), this is measured by the differential amplifier, and a low-pass filter performs analog filtering of the signal. Analog low-pass filters are inherently reactive components implemented with storage components such as capacitors and inductors. Therefore, the DC voltage component is measured and stored by the sensing resistor, differential amplifier, and filter combination.

With respect to claim 18, the applicant alleges that Cotreau does not teach a retrievably stored voltage level; the examiner respectfully disagrees. See page 14. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, the voltage stored as energy by the low-pass filter (46) is broken down and sourced to the comparator (48) (i.e. retrievably stored).

Claims 14, 31, and 38 are cancelled.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter F Briney III whose telephone number is 703-305-0347. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W Isen can be reached on 703-305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WFB
10/13/04

①

XU MEI
PRIMARY EXAMINER